



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_37249
Title of the Manuscript:	Development of an Improved Crucible Furnace using Locally Sourced Materials for Teaching and Learning Purposes in Metallurgical Laboratory
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments Abstract Referencing Entire work	Please rephrase your entire abstract and also check sentence errors for better understanding of the entire study carried out. Please check this And Please format your referencing style in the entire text to standards ie [1], [2], [3],..... etc Your entire work is riddled with grammatical errors and inconsistencies. Please take your time and reconcile these issues and more importantly tell us the improvements implemented on the Crucible that made it achieve better efficiency as compared to other developed Crucibles.	The corrections have been made as directed
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		I accepted all reviewers' results/comments with great thanks. All observations have been noted and taken care of.